

32692

Customer Number

Patent
Case No.: 59419US002

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor: SCHERER, RICHARD J.

Application No.: 10/788684

Confirmation No.: 7027

Filed: February 27, 2004

Title: CONNECTOR APPARATUS

BRIEF ON APPEAL

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Commissioner:

This is an appeal from the Office Action mailed on February 28, 2006, in light of the Advisory Action mailed March 27, 2006, finally rejecting claims 1-16.

☐ Please charge the fee provided in 37 CFR § 41.20(b)(2) to Deposit Account No.

13-3723. One copy of this sheet marked duplicate is also enclosed.

☒ Any required fee will be paid at the time of EFS-Web submission.

☒ If necessary, charge any required fee, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3723.

A Notice of Appeal in this application was mailed on April 27, 2006, and was received in the USPTO on April 27, 2006.

Appellants request the opportunity for a personal appearance before the Board of Appeals to argue the issues of this appeal. The fee for the personal appearance will be timely paid upon receipt of the Examiner's Answer.

12/11/2006 CKHLOK 00000007 133723 10788684

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

Applicants further note that according to the Examiner, it would be obvious to extend the shield blades far enough to make electrical connection. As can be seen in Fig. 5, and as is explained at p. 8, lines 16-17, the shield blades of the header connector are too short to make electrical contact with the shielding elements of the socket connector and therefore do not make electrical connection. Accordingly, Applicants again assert that it would not be obvious to alter the shield blades of the Ramey header connector to make them substantially coplanar with the internal surface of the header body.

For these reasons, Applicant(s) submit that the cited references will not support a 103(a) rejection of the claims invention and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In addition to the foregoing, Applicant(s) submit that a dependent claim should be considered allowable when its parent claim is allowed. *In re McCairn*, 1012 USPQ 411 (CCPA 1954). Accordingly, Applicants submit that all claims depending from claim 1 should also be allowed.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner has erred in rejecting this application. Please reverse the Examiner on all counts.

Respectfully submitted,

July 27, 2006
Date

By: Melanie Gover
Melanie G. Gover, Reg. No.: 41,793
Telephone No.: 512-984-4308

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833